

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present Response, claims 1-6 will have been amended.

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the indication that the drawings filed on June 2, 2005 have been accepted. Applicants also thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for foreign priority and for the indication that a certified copy of the priority document has been received. Additionally, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for attaching a copy of the Notice of References Cited, a copy of the Information Disclosure Statement and PTO-1449 form that were filed on September 15, 2005, and a copy of the PTO-1449 form that was filed with the Information Disclosure Statement that was filed on July 14, 2008, the copies of the documents filed on September 15, 2005 and July 14, 2008 each containing an indication that the documents cited therein have been considered by the Examiner.

In the outstanding Official Action, claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-6 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by CHOUNG et al. (U.S. 6,295,550).

Applicants do not acquiesce in the propriety of the Examiner's rejections, but have amended the claims solely in order to expedite prosecution and obtain early allowance of the claims.

The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Office Action asserts that claims 1, 4, and 5 are apparatus claims that do not recite any hardware, processor in the body of the claims. Further, the Office Action asserts that the "terminal" recited in claims 1, 4, and 5 can be software *per se*. As such, the Office Action asserted that the claims are directed toward non-statutory subject matter.

The clarity of independent claims 1, 4, and 5 has been enhanced to more clearly recite hardware. For example, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a session opening request signal transmitter that transmits a session opening request signal for requesting opening of the session with the receiving terminal apparatus, to the session control server; a reservation process setting request signal transmitter that, while the session is opened, transmits a reservation process setting request signal for requesting the setting of a reservation process that is executed after the session is closed, to the session control server; and a session closing request signal transmitter that transmits a session closing request signal for requesting the closing of the session, to the session control server. Thus, amended claim 1 clearly recites hardware elements, and constitutes eligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. For similar reasons, amended claims 4 and 5 also recite eligible subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. For example, claim 4 recites, *inter alia*, a receiving terminal apparatus...comprising a session opening request signal receiver...and a reservation process execution request signal receiver that receives a reservation process execution request signal transmitted from the session control server, according to a reservation process set by the transmitting terminal apparatus while the session is opened, such that the reservation process is executed after the session is closed; and claim 5, recites, *inter alia*, a session control apparatus comprising a session opening request signal receiver...and a reservation process setter that, while the session is opened, sets a reservation process that is executed after the session is closed, according to the received reservation process setting request signal. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Office Action asserts that CHOUNG et al. discloses the process of requesting to define a session which includes information about the nature (objective) of the session and hence a reservation process executed when the opened session is changed. In support of its assertion, the Office Action relies upon col. 9, lines 5-32 of CHOUNG et al.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a transmitting terminal apparatus...comprising a session opening request signal transmitter that transmits a session opening request signal for requesting opening of the session with the receiving terminal apparatus...and a reservation process setting request signal transmitter that, while the session is opened, transmits a reservation process setting request signal for requesting the setting of a reservation process that is executed after the session is closed.

Thus, the present invention advantageously provides the capability of setting a reservation process during a communication session, which is executed after the communication session is closed. For example, while a salesperson is engaged in a communication session with a customer, the salesperson can set a reservation process (e.g., for sending a catalog, questionnaire or other materials to the customer), which will be executed after the communication session is ended. Accordingly, a the salesperson can notify the customer of an intention to send, for example, a questionnaire that will be, for example, displayed on a display of the customer, after the communication session has ended.

On the other hand, CHOUNG et al. discloses that each session contains a session definition, a session list for the session, and a leading terminal schedule. The leading terminal schedule includes the name(s) and network address(es) of the user terminal(s) that will act as leading terminal(s) for the associated session. If a number of user terminals will act as leading

terminals in a sequential order, the leading terminal schedule indicates the order, according to which the terminals take the responsibility as leading terminals. If two or more terminals will act as leading terminals according to a specific time schedule, the leading terminal schedule indicates the time period for each of the terminals, in which a user terminal for that time period takes the responsibility as leading terminals (col. 9, lines 5-32). Thus, CHOUNG et al. discloses a static, specific time schedule set in advance that governs the terminal processing. Accordingly, CHOUNG et al. does not disclose, teach, or suggest a reservation process setting request signal transmitter that, while the session is opened, transmits a reservation process setting request signal for requesting the setting of a reservation process that is executed after the session is closed, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, CHOUNG et al. does not disclose “each and every” feature recited in claim 1, as would be required for claim 1 to be properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 over CHOUNG et al. Claim 4, which recites, *inter alia*, a session opening request signal receiver...and a reservation process execution request signal receiver that receives a reservation process execution request signal transmitted from the session control server, according to a reservation process set by the transmitting terminal apparatus while the session is opened, such that the reservation process is executed after the session is closed, and claim 5, which recites, *inter alia*, a session opening request signal receiver...and a reservation process setter that, while the session is opened, sets a reservation process that is executed after the session is closed, according to the received reservation process setting request signal, are allowable for at least similar reasons.

Consequently, claims 1, 4, and 5 are in condition for allowance. With regard to dependent claims 2-3, and 6, they are allowable on their own merit, in addition to being allowable for depending either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 or 5, which

Applicants have shown to be allowable. Thus, at least in view of these arguments, claims 1-6 are in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of the claims, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the claims in view of the above remarks.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The present application is in condition for allowance. Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,
Masao KATO et al.


Bruce H. Bernstein

8/29/09

Reg. No. 29,027

June 29, 2009
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191